



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/816,011	03/11/1997	MARK H. PAUSCH	34.421-C2	6532
22852	7590	06/14/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PAK, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/816,011

Applicant(s)

PAUSCH, MARK H.

Examiner

Michael Pak

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24, 27, 29, 30 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment filed 24 March 2004 has been entered. Claims 22, 24, 27, 29-30, and 33 are pending.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 24 March 2004, have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. Claims 22, 24, 27, 29-30, and 33 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The reason for the rejection has been set forth in the previous office actions.

Applicants argue that US patent No. 6,511,824 disclose two pore potassium channels and teaches a number of utilities for the channels. However, the two pore potassium channel disclosed in the current application is not the same channel as the TWIK in '824. Furthermore, the '824 patent does not teach in the specification the specific pesticides or diseases which interact or are associated with the channel. The present application also lacks the specific pesticide or diseases which interact or are

Art Unit: 1646

associated with the channel. There is no nexus between the applicant's channel and pesticide or diseases. The polypeptide lacks substantial utility because further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. Thus, the asserted utility lacks substantial and specific utility because further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. *Brenner V. Manson* 383 U.S. 519, 535-536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) stated that "Congress intended that no patents be granted on an chemical compound whose sole "utility" consists of its potential role as an object of use-testing ... a patent is not a hunting license." *Brenner* further states that "It is not a reward for the search , but compensation for its successful conclusion." Any utility of the nucleic acid encoding the protein or other specific asserted utility is directly dependent on the function of the protein. A circular assertion of utility is created where the utility of the protein is needed to break out the circular assertion of utility. The claimed polypeptides do not substantial utility because the skilled artisan would need to prepare, isolate, and analyze the protein in order to determine its functional nexus with human therapeutics. Therefore, the invention is not in readily available form. Instead, further experimentation of the protein itself would be required before it could be used. The disclosed use for the nucleic acid molecule of the claimed invention is generally applicable to any nucleic acid and therefore is not particular to the nucleic acid sequence claimed. The claims directed to vectors and host cells do not have utility because the nucleic acid without utility is needed to practice the inventions.

Applicants argue that potassium channels as a family have utility that is recognized in the art. However, the specification on pages 2-5 teaches that there are many different kinds of potassium channels with different structure and function and these different channels interact uniquely with different ligand which may be used for therapeutics. There is no nexus between the presently claimed two pore channels and potassium channels which are known to cause diseases.

Claims 22, 24, 27, 29-30, and 33 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 24, 27, 29-30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This a written description rejection.

Claim 24 encompass an isolated nucleic acid encoding variants and fragments of proteins because the claim is drawn to functional derivative without functional limitation. Claims 27, 29-30 and 33 are dependent on claim 24. The reason for the rejection was set forth in the previous office action. The newly amended claims now contain structural

Art Unit: 1646

limitations which are generic and are limited by functional limitation for only the nucleotide sequence encoding the potassium channel. However, the functional derivative do not have functional limitation. The essential feature of the invention is the nucleic acid molecule which encodes a CORK two pore potassium channel of SEQ ID NO:36, and one of skilled in the art cannot envision the full genus of molecules of the claimed variant nucleic acid molecules.

6. No claims are allowed.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (571) 272-0887.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.



Michael Pak
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
10 June 2004